

The “information signal transmission device, connected to a network, for transmitting an information signal,” has been amended to “an information signal device connected to a network.”

Page 3, the first paragraph of the Office Action states:

“Line 4, refers to an ‘information receiver’ for receiving a message broadcast to the network. It is unclear how the ‘transmission device’ could comprise an ‘information receiver’ to receive the message it has transmitted by the ‘transmission device’.”

The “information receiver” has been deleted.

In the second paragraph of page 3, the Office Action states:

“Line 5 refers to an ‘event manager’ for delivering the broadcast message within the ‘device’ (apparently the device from line 1). It is unclear how the ‘transmission device’ could comprise an ‘event manager’ for delivering the broadcast message within the same ‘transmission device’ in which the broadcast message has transmitted to the network.”

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “an event manager for directing the messages generated by the object to destinations within and outside the information signal device.

Paragraph 3 of page 3 of the Office Action states:

“Moreover, line 6 refers ‘an object can exchange a message with an unspecified destination without any discrimination between outside and inside the device by exchanging the message with event manager in a one-to-one communication’. It is unclear how the exchange process of the ‘message’ that has transmitted over the network could be done between an ‘object’ and the ‘event manager’. Furthermore, it is unclear how a broadcast ‘message’ does not have any *specific address destination* as claimed ‘with an unspecified destination’. Without any specific address destination, it is unclear how the devices connect to the network could communicate to each other.”

Claim 1 has been amended to add “at least one object for generating messages concerning events occurring in the information signal device,” and that “the message generated by the object are delivered without any discrimination by the object as to whether the destinations of the messages

are outside or inside the information signal device by exchanging the messages with the event manager in a one-to-one communication.

Paragraph 4 of page 3 of the Office Action, states:

“In claim 2, line 2 refers to an “information transmitter” broadcasts each message... and holds the broadcast message, and transmits the message held in response to a transmission request. It is unclear how the ‘transmission device’ could comprise an ‘information transmitter’ to broadcast messages that has transmitted by the ‘transmission device’ as cited in claim 1. Furthermore, it is unclear how the ‘information transmitter’ is able to hold the message that has transmitted by the ‘transmission device’ and able to transmit the message held that has transmitted by the ‘transmission device’ in response to a transmission request.”

The “information transmitter” has been amended to “the broadcasting device”. Claim 2 further states that the broadcasting device “holds the broadcast messages and transmits the held messages in response to a transmission request from the event manager.”

As described above, each instance of the claim language which the Office Action states are unclear under § 112, second paragraph, has been addressed and was directly responsive thereto. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office communication of asserting non-responsiveness is improper, and requests that the Examiner enter and consider the claims as amended in the Amendment filed on July 11, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY


B. Joe Kim

Reg. No. 41,895

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4354

Dated: October 20, 2003